

REMARKS

[0010] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-13, 15, 17-21, 32, and 34-39 are currently pending
- Claims 3 and 18 are canceled herein
- Claims 1-2, 4-13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 32 and 37 are amended herein.

[0011] Editorial changes have been made throughout the claims to correct informalities found therein. The amendments do not add any new subject matter. Further, to the extent any of such amendments are intended to address any of the outstanding rejections, explanations thereof are provided below. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

[0012] Claims 1, 32 and 37 are amended to include subject matter from dependent claims 3 and 18.

[0013] If the Examiner's reply to this Response is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, then Applicant formally requests the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney to quickly and efficiently resolve any issues.

[0014] Applicant encourages the Examiner to call and schedule a date and time for a telephone communication that is most convenient for both of us. Alternately, Applicant also encourages email communication in lieu of telephone communication. Applicant's attorney contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

Claims 1 and 32 Comply With § 112 2nd Paragraph

[0015] Claims 1 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

[0016] Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting prosecution and without acquiescing in the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant herein amends claims 1 and 32 as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments render the § 112, ¶ 2 rejections moot.

Cited Documents

[0017] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- *Tang*: Tang, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,793,365
- *Lee*: Lee, et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,330,845
- *Simpson*: Simpson, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2008/0168138
- *Puskala*: Puskala, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0165024

Claims 1-13, 15, 20, 21, 32, 34, and 36-39 Are Non-Obvious Over Tang in view of Lee and further in view of Simpson

[0018] Claims 1-13, 15, 20, 21, 32, 34, and 36-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Tang in view of Lee and further in view of Simpson. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

[0019] Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of this rejection and for the sole purpose of expediting allowance, Applicant herein incorporates now-canceled dependent claims 3 and 18 into independent claim 1. Similar to original claim 1, the Office rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Tang in view of Lee in further view of Simpson. The Office rejected dependent claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Tang in view of Lee in further view of Simpson and in further view of Puskala. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant respectfully asserts the references fail to teach or suggest the following emphasized features:

Independent Claim 1 (emphasis added)

1. (Currently Amended) A system comprising:

a processor;

a memory; and

a group interaction application maintained in the memory and executed on the processor to present a graphical user interface for facilitating a group interaction among a first user and one or more other users, the graphical user interface comprising:

 a group identification area configured to display visual representations of a plurality of online social groups in which the first user is a member, wherein:

 the first user's membership in the group is maintained when the first user is offline; and

 the visual representations of online social groups are automatically arranged by at least one of:

 a geographic location associated with a member of one of the online social groups;

 a date and time of a most recent communication between the first user and another member of one of the online social groups; and

 a frequency of communication between the first user and another member of one of the online social groups,

 wherein the visual representations of online social groups are **filtered, at least in part, based on geographical location information associated with one or more members of the online social groups;** and

 a group activities menu comprising a plurality of selectable items representing social activities in which the first user, as a member of a selected group may participate, such that a plurality of group activities in which a member

of the selected group who is logged on via a mobile device may participate is different than a plurality of group activities in which a member of the selected group who is logged on via a non-mobile device may participate,

wherein the social activities in which a **mobile member of the selected group may participate comprise a group of activities that are available to group members who are mobile but that are not available to a group member who is logged on via a non-mobile device.**

[0020] Claim 1, as amended, recites, in part, “the visual representations of online social groups are **filtered, at least in part, based on geographical location information associated with one or more members of the online social groups.**”

(Emphasis added.) Tang is directed to a “system and method [that] provides each networked computer user with a user interface displaying visual representations of selected other computer users...and further provides communication mechanisms for efficiently and easily contacting any of the displayed workers.” (Tang, Abstract.)

Specifically, Tang recites “[w]hile these electronic facilities can very efficiently aid the flow of raw information across the physical distances that separate group members, they do not provide the same degree of immediate access, and rich sense of group awareness and coordination that is shared by people who work physically in the same location.” (Tang, Col. 2, lines 20-25) That is, Tang is referring to group members are separated across “physical distances” or geographical locations, i.e., the group members may be located in different geographical locations. However, Tang does not teach or suggest “the visual representations of online social groups are **filtered, at least in part, based on geographical location information associated with one or more members of the online social groups,**” as recited in amended claim 1. (Emphasis added.)

[0021] Meanwhile, Lee is cited for disclosing the concept of monitoring the frequency of communication between the first user and another member of one of the online social groups. (Office Action, page 6.) Lee is directed to a “system, method and program product for providing navigational information for facilitating navigation and user socialization at web sites.” (Lee, Title.) More particularly, Lee recites “[t]his problem of how to turn a user who is a looker into a booker (i.e., purchaser)...the prior art has used social filtering technology to solve part of this problem and would benefit from having additional data for its social filtering technology.” (Lee, Col. 4, lines 9-17.) Lee suggests that filtering technology is commonly used, however, Lee does not teach or suggest “visual representations of online social groups are filtered, at least in part, **based on geographical location information associated with one or more members of the online social groups**,” as recited in amended claim 1 and does not remedy the deficiencies in Tang.. (Emphasis added.)

[0022] Simpson is cited for disclosing a similar limitation as, “a user’s membership in the group is maintained when the user is offline.” (Office Action, page 6.) .Simpson is directed to a “system and method for notifying an offline global computer network user of an online interaction.” (Simpson, Title.) Simpson is silent with respect to the incorporated language from dependent claim 3 and does not remedy the deficiencies in Tang and Lee.

[0023] As stated above, dependent claim 18 is incorporated into claim 1. Dependent claim 18 was rejected as allegedly obvious over Tang in view of Lee in view of Simpson and in further view of Puskala.

[0024] Claim 1 recites, in part, “the social activities in which **a mobile member of the selected group may participate comprise a group of activities that are available to group members who are mobile but that are not available to a group member who is logged on via a non-mobile device.**” (Emphasis added.) The Office states and Applicant agrees that Tang, Lee and Simpson are silent on this element and do not teach or disclose the amended language.

[0025] Puskala is directed to a “system and method for mobile terminal user to communicate with each other.” (Puskala, Abstract.) Puskala recites that “[c]ertain business-oriented commercial applications that operate over wireless networks likewise use predefined messages at times. However, none of these applications have applied the use of predefined messages to games played by multiple players over a mobile network.” (Puskala, Paragraph [0006].) However, merely not using predefined messages in a particular application does not teach or suggest “**a mobile member of the selected group may participate comprise a group of activities that are available to group members who are mobile but that are not available to a group member who is logged on via a non-mobile device**”, as recited in amended claim 1.

[0026] Consequently, Tang, Lee, Simpson and Puskala, whether taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

[0027] **Dependent claims 2-13, 15, 20 and 21** ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 2-13, 15, 20 and 21 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at

least their dependency from allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

[0028] **Independent claim 32** is rejected as being obvious over Tang, Lee and Simpson for similar reasons as claim 1. Claim 32 is allowable at least for reasons similar to those discussed above in regards to claim 1.

[0029] **Dependent claims 34 and 36** depend from independent claim 32 and are allowable by virtue of their dependency from allowable claim 32, as well as for the additional features that each recites.

[0030] **Independent claim 37** is rejected as being anticipated over obvious over Tang, Lee and Simpson for similar reasons as claim 1. Claim 37 is allowable at least for reasons similar to those discussed above in regards to claim 1.

[0031] **Dependent claims 38 and 39** depend from independent claim 32 and are allowable by virtue of their dependency from allowable claim 32, as well as for the additional features that each recites.

Claims 17-19 and 35 Are Non-Obvious Over Tang, Lee, and Simpson, in view of Puskala

[0032] Claims 17-19 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Tang, Lee, and Simpson, in view of Puskala. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

[0033] Claims 17-19 ultimately depend from independent claim 1 and claim 35 ultimately depends from independent 32. As discussed above, claims 1 and 32 are

allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 17-19 and 35 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Conclusion

[0034] Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Dale G. Mohlenhoff 37,683/ Dated: September 2, 2009
Dale G. Mohlenhoff (dalem@leehayes.com; 509-944-4738)
Registration No. 46576

David S. Lee
Registration No. 38,222